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Luvian Evidence for PIE *H₂eit- ‘take along; fetch’

Tichy (2004) has established a PIE verbal root *H₂eit- ‘take along’ on the basis of Gk. οἶσσομαί ‘fetch, take long’ and Lat. utor ‘use’. I may summarize the crucial points of her demonstration as follows. Most Homeric examples of οἶσσομαί mean not merely ‘carry, bring’, but specifically ‘fetch’. That is, they include motion to a place to obtain something as well as bringing it back and handing it over (2004:179-84). Other uses refer to carrying something in conjunction with a movement that is an independent act: ‘take along’ (2004:185-87). Tichy takes this meaning as original and argues that the shift in sense to ‘fetch’ likely arose in collocation with motion verbs “…*geh und denk daran, mitzunehmen ➔ geh und hol/bring’ oder *er ging und wollte sich mitnehmen ➔ *er ging, um sich zu holen’…’

In formal terms οἶσσομαί reflects an old desiderative stem in *-se/o- to a root *H₂eis/t- (*hōis/t-). Assumption of a root shape *H₂eit- also permits derivation of Lat. ēte from an e-grade category: thematic present or root present *H₂eit-/H₂eit-. Tichy chooses the latter, with the Latin deponent reflecting an innovative Italic oppositional middle (2004:192-96). The sense of the middle shifts from *‘take along for oneself’ to ‘make use of’. She seeks direct evidence for the active root present in the Duenos inscription: oisi is an infinitive (for *oiṣṣi) and oit is an imperative second singular (for *oīd) with a meaning ‘take along’ (2004:196-99). For a different view of the Duenos forms see Dupraz in Blanc et al. (2004:337-39). Crucial for present purposes is a root of the form *H₂eit- that shows a sense ‘fetch’ arising from use with motion verbs.

We find attested twice in a single passage the Cuneiform Luvian verb ḥizzal-ı-. The context of the following passage KUB 35.102+ ii 11-iii 7 is that of the end of a birth ritual. Compare the colophon (line iii 10): 2 ḥukmaš armuwaš QAT[I] ‘Two birth rituals. (The text) is complete’. For the text see Starke (1985:222).

[iu]ni=wa 4EN.ZU-ananza kummaya[nza]
[ha]iayannanza apan ḥizzain[ni]
iyandu=ku=wa zaššin DUMU-anmašši[n]
ānīnin warallīn uwa[a]ndu]
[a]nīš=ku=wa=ti parnan=za madd[u][wati]
[p]apparkuwaatti tātīš=pa=wa=ti=t2[ta]
x-tiyati pušriya[tī]
[p]appašatti [-]
[p]a=wa iyandu 4EN.ZU-inzi x[...]
kummayanza ḥatayannanza
apan ḥizzaindu
zam=pa=ku=wa DUMU-nin wallindu
sannindu pa=wa=an=tar ānni
ištani diwaṇdu pa=as pūwa
[ku]w[ati ašta nanum=ḫa=as apatī āšdu
‘Let us go and fetch him from the holy h.-of the moons/months.’
‘Let them also go and bring this child’s own mother.’
The mother shall also purify the house with wine, while the father shall sprinkle it with puṣuviya.-
‘Let the [ ] moons/months go and fetch him from the holy hatayanna.-
‘Let them also lift and turn upside down this child. Let them place him on the mother’s breast. As she was before, so let her also be now.’

In Melchert (1993:75) I tentatively translated hizzā(i)- as ‘hand over’, based on the cooccurrence with both accusative and dative objects. However, the immediately following context clearly refers to the birth of the child, so it makes far better sense to suppose that the child is being fetched from the ‘holy hatayanna-’, with a ‘dative of disadvantage.’ The word hatayanna- (attested only here) may refer either to some kind of assistants of the months or to the supposed source (place) from which the months obtain children (a pluralantum would not be surprising for such a concept). Due to the merger of the dative and locative cases in Hittite and Luvian, the dative-locative may express ‘from’ with inanimate objects as well as with persons. For such a use in Luvian compare KARKAMIŠ A6 §28: ta-sā-pa-wa/i-ta-si NEG Jiti CUM-ni ARH4 tā-ya ‘or takes away a stele from a stele’ (parallel to ablative-instrumentals in preceding and following clauses).

It is also noteworthy that our verb occurs in both instances in the so-called “serial” construction with the verb ‘go’, which is frequent in Hittite (see most recently van den Hout 2003), but attested for certain only here in Luvian. Thus not only does the specific meaning ‘fetch’ established for H[e]it- by Tichy illuminate our Luvian passage, but the collocation with a motion verb that she predicted is also directly attested. While it is possible that the development of the sense ‘fetch’ is a parallel independent innovation in Greek and Luvian, I find it more likely that the PIE verb already had this connotation.

The attested imperative third plural hizzāindu and indicative present first plural hizzāni[n]i argue for a synchronic Luvian stem hizzā(i)- of the class of denominatives in *eHye/o- (see Melchert 1997:133-34); compare preterite third plural ḫti<ṣ́ašṭa ‘made ready’ to tiššā(i)- ‘make ready, fashion’ and infinitives gülzāuna ‘to draw’ and ṣatālhauna ‘to fetter’ versus from stems in -a- the infinitives palšuna < palša- ‘spread’ and first plurals maršu<ni > marša- ‘?’, pīnumu < pīya- ‘give’, and ḫānumu < ḫuya- ‘run’, which show in synchronic terms deletion of the stem-final -a-. As Michael Weiss reminds me, the stem hizzā(i)- could be derived directly from the root *H[e]it- if we assumed a virtual stem *H[e]it-śeHye/o- comparable to the type of Lat. uexāre ‘afflict, harass’. However, the absence of any other evidence for this type in Anatolian makes me hesitant to reconstruct such a source for our verb.

The preform *H[e]it-se/o- reconstructed for Gk. οὐκόμαι would lead regularly to a CLuvian stem *hizza- for which we would expect inflection as a ħi-verb, as in marked imperfectives in -ssa- (for which see Jasanoff 2003:132, 136-39): *hizzai, hizzantii like CLuv. karmalaššai ‘becomes crippled’. The fact that in our verb the sequence *-t-s- produced -zz- would make no difference, since by analogy to imperfectives in -ssa- Luvian imperfectives in -zza- < *-sk̩e/o- also inflect as ħi-verbs: CLuv. ḫalwatnazzai ‘gets excited’ (or sim.).

However, lexicalization of *hizza- as a base verb ‘fetch’ (cf. lexicalized -sk̩e- in Hitt. īskē- ‘anoint’ or duške- ‘rejoice’) would have left the verb open to analogical influence of the Luvian verbs with a fixed stem in -ā-. One may compare the behavior of the cited lexicalized Hittite stems in -sk̩e-, where we find innovative and analogical iškiyazi, duškiyazi, dušgai, duškun versus the very stable inflection of stems in -sk̩e- when they function as marked imperfectives (see Oettinger 1979:326). It is therefore likely that lexicalized *hizza- inflected as a mi-verb.

Stems in fixed -ā- crucially included those with and without lented endings. Per Melchert (1994:69, 1997:132) Luvo-Lycian verbs in -a- with unleted endings continue denominatives in *eH₂- with loss of laryngeal before stop after the Proto-Anatolian lention rule. But such stems were originally ḥi-verbs (Jasanoff 2003:139-41), so the attested inflection and lack of lention is secondary (thus already Hajnal
Loss of *H₂ before stops, therefore *precedes the lenition rule (with Hajnal 1995:162). This chronology also allows derivation of CLuv. manātī ‘sees’ < *mēnēH₂tī, with a root shape attested elsewhere, instead of an invented *mēH₂tī (with Starke 1980:147 contra Melchert 1994:237 et alibi). CLuvian also surely had some simple thematic stems in *-ati/-anti with lenited third singular ending: compare HLuv. AEDIFICARE+MI-ri+i ‘builds’, i.e. [tamari], rhotacized from *tamadi.

The presence in CLuvian of stems with lenited third singulars -ati/-ata beside third plurals -anti/-anta would have particularly favored interchange with stems in -ati/-anti, and such interference is in fact well attested, in both directions. For stems in -ā(i)- we also find forms with -ā- inflection: puwā(i)- ‘crush’ (NB lenited 3sg. pres. puwāti and the Hittite stem puwā(i)-) shows 3pl. inv. piwāni (expect *puiwāni, pāšiḥā(i)- ‘pulverize’ (lenited 3sg. pres. pāšiḥāti) shows 1sg. pret. pāšiḥabha (unlenited)!. Conversely in stems in -ā- we find forms with -ā(i)- inflection: lāla- ‘take’ shows the infinitive lalāuna (expect *lalāuna, aruna-‘?’ (NB 2sg. inv. arunā/ārūna) shows 3pl. inv. arunānida beside expected arunāndu. For 2sg. inv. as diagnostic for an a-stem (contra Melchert 1993:33) compare to stems in -ā(i)- 2sg. inv. tiśāi, uṣantarāi, annarammāi. We are thus allowed likewise to assume that the attested -ā(i)- forms ḥizzaānā and ḥizzaindu are secondary to an a-stem *hīza-.

It would obviously be desirable to have at least one attested example of our verb with the predicted a-stem inflection, in order to confirm the proposed derivation. However, the precise meaning ‘fetch’ in collocation with a motion verb and the formal match between hīzaV- and *H₂eitV- are to striking to be mere coincidence. CLuv. hīza(i)- provides not only a third reflex of PIE *H₂eit- ‘take along; fetch’ beside Gk. οἴσκω and Lat. utor, but also further welcome evidence for the appearance of word-initial *H₂ in Hittite and Luvian as h-.
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